

E 664

. Q 2 N 5

Copy 2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 132 3

MATTHEW S. QUAY

UNITED STATES SENATOR AND CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL
REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE.

The Kind of Man this Republican Leader Is.

REPRINTED FROM

THE NEW YORK EVENING POST.

"

copy 2

E. 664

. G2 N5

copy 2.

For sale by THE EVENING POST, 210 Broadway, New York. Price 5 cents per copy, post-paid; \$3 per hundred, postage or expressage extra.

THE QUAY CASE.

WE print herewith an account of some of the most striking passages in the life of Mr. Matthew S. Quay, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, and now United States Senator from Pennsylvania, and undoubtedly the most powerful and influential adviser of the Administration. We doubt if there can be found in political history so striking an illustration of the deadness which may overtake the public conscience, even in a great Christian community, as his election, after a short interval of three years, to the office of State Treasurer, when he had already committed a defalcation as Secretary of the Commonwealth. As will be seen by our brief memoir, Quay, between 1879 and 1882, being then Secretary, took money out of the Treasury, and lost \$260,000 of it in stock speculation, and was saved from exposure by the assistance of Senator Don Cameron, to avoid the scandal it would bring on the party. This is, of course, something that often happens. Other officers in other States have done the same thing. But as a rule, after doing it, they have either been sent to the penitentiary, or have committed suicide, or have retired into absolute obscurity.

Nothing of the sort happened to Quay. He did not even go into obscurity. He simply bided his time. In 1885, with the knowledge of his offence widely diffused through the community, through all the Republican politicians of the State, through the leading business men and lawyers of Philadelphia, through the leading newspaper offices of the city, Quay again got himself nominated, this time for the charge of the very treasury in which he had committed a fraud so tremendous that the leading Republican paper, the *Philadelphia Press*, said in opposing the nomination, that "it would take the lid from off the Treasury and uncover secrets before which Republicans would stand dumb." We ourselves have known for more than a year what this meant, and have again and again called on the *Press* and other Philadelphia journals to explain it, but in vain. Moreover, Quay was reelected in 1885. After having been reelected he went to the very treasury from which he had once taken money, and took some more, and he took it for the same purpose—speculation in stocks! This time he made money in the transaction, and was thus able to replace what he had abstracted; but one of his confederates had finally to threaten him with legal proceedings in order to get his share of the swag.

These facts were notorious when he was made Chairman of the Republican National Committee. They were, doubtless, well known to John Wanamaker when, fresh from his devotions every morning, he handed Quay large sums of money for campaign purposes without requiring from him any detailed account; they were known to the Pennsylvania Legislature

when they passed a vote of thanks for the manner in which he had conducted the Republican canvass, and finally when they elected him United States Senator. Were they not known also, in whole or in part, to Mr. Harrison when that good pious Elder of the Second Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis submitted himself to Quay's dictation touching the State patronage?

To comment on these things or draw deductions from them touching the moral condition of the community in which they have occurred, and of the Administration which has winked at and condoned them, would be almost an impertinence. Pennsylvania has plenty of moralists who are far better equipped for the task than we are, in possessing a wider knowledge of the qualifying facts than we possess. To their hands we may safely leave it. But we cannot dismiss the subject without noticing the line of defence put forward by a despatch to his own paper from Washington, from Mr. Reed, the editor of the *Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette*, after consultation, it is said, with Quay. The theory of this document is that the exposures of Quay made by the *World*, and to be repeated by *The Evening Post*, are the result of a conspiracy of "free-trade shouters," who have "a decided horror of Senator Quay's ability as the most astute politician of the country." "They are furious because he dislodged them from power in 1888." Now *The Evening Post* is attacking him. Why does it do it? Simply because it is "the chief advocate in America of British ideas in political economy, designed specially to benefit the Briton at the expense of other people." "Senator Quay as the Republican National Chairman stands between the free-traders and their designs, and *The Evening Post*, subservient to their will," etc., etc.

The man who wrote this, as a truthful answer to the question, "Why is Quay unfit to hold high office is this community?" is not simply a prominent editor, but also professedly a very religious man, like so many others of Quay's friends. It will be seen that he not only ignores Quay's defalcations and embezzlement of Treasury funds, and the other flaws in his character which ought to make religious men think him "low company," but he pretends to believe that the only objections to Quay are due to his views about the tariff. Now, here is a state of things which we may fairly, without offence, commend to the careful examination of clergymen all over the country, and to all persons of whatever calling who believe that morality covers the whole of human conduct. At this moment the chief problem before the American people seems to be not so much the infusion of more wisdom into legislation as the bringing of politicians within the jurisdiction of the Ten Commandments. Unless more progress can be made in this direction, reformatory laws will do us but little good.

Some Passages in the Life of M. S. Quay.

"Take the lid from off the State Treasury and uncover secrets before which Republicans would stand dumb."—Philadelphia Press (Republican.)

The New York *World* nearly two months ago printed a series of accusations of a very serious character against Matthew Stanley Quay, United States Senator from Pennsylvania. The story filled between fifteen and sixteen columns of the *World*, and was in eight chapters, the first seven chapters being printed on February 10, and the last chapters on March 3. It was apparently a complete history of the Pennsylvania politician's life, from his birth to the present time. Specific charges of criminal conduct, embezzling the moneys belonging to the State, bribery and attempted bribery, were made against him. Particulars were given of the stolen money being restored through the generosity of United States Senator Don Cameron, and of Quay's being thus saved from the penitentiary. Numerous other charges of general political corruption, treachery, drunkenness, and debauchery were made at great length. In consequence, however, of the generally untrustworthy character of the *World's* stories, little or no attention was paid to the matter; the newspapers throughout the country barely mentioned it. That the Philadelphia papers did not refer to the matter did not, of course, surprise any one, because, as one of the best citizens of the Quaker City said to a reporter of *The Evening Post* this week, "there is scarcely a paper in Philadelphia that dares to say anything against Quay or Wanamaker, or any of the political 'bosses' of Pennsylvania."

Quay's political power, he added, and Wanamaker's advertising patronage, to say nothing of his "political pull," enable the politicians to control all the Philadelphia papers as absolutely as if they were "muzzled," and as illustrating this, the fact may be mentioned that, although Mr. Henry C. Lea is recognized by all as, in some senses, the foremost citizen of Philadelphia, Col. McClure's *Times* and the *Evening Telegraph* were the only papers in that city that dared to publish his letter to the President calling attention to the charges against Quay.

But a number of prominent and well-known and independent men of Philadelphia, of both political parties, being of the opinion that Pennsylvanians, and also President Harrison, should know from a responsible source what kind of man Quay is, and was, and the way in which the Government of the Keystone State is prostituted, begged *The Evening Post* to take the matter up, and give it the benefit of publication in its columns, at the same time assuring *The Evening Post* that the charges against Quay were true. We accordingly have made an independent investigation of the charges preferred against Quay by the *World*, and found on unimpeachable testimony (in many cases the testimony of Quay's own friends) that these charges were substantially true. As to the charges of embezzling State moneys, and the use of State money for speculation, the evidence in detail of guilt is overwhelming. The main facts contained in the *World* story, therefore, together with other essential details, are accordingly reprinted in *The Evening Post*.

HIS EARLY LIFE.

Matthew Stanley Quay was born in 1833, at Dillsburg, Pa., and was the son of a clergyman. Early in life he removed to Beaver, in the same State, and received only a fair education. He studied law, but soon preferred politics to the bar.

Beaver is a Republican community, and of the county vote of about 8,000 the Democracy polls about 3,500. Quay early became a recognized power at party caucuses and primaries, and it

was not long before he began his public career as an office-holder as Prothonotary of Beaver County. This was accomplished apparently by a skilful manipulation of votes. After serving as Prothonotary he went to Harrisburg and became private secretary to Gov. Curtin. He soon tired of that occupation, and secured from the Governor (in August, 1862) a place in the One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment, and went into the field. Then it was that he

first showed his fondness for intoxicating drinks, which has remained with him ever since.

Quay only served a year with his regiment in the field. The same influence which secured him his military appointment caused him to be detached and made the agent for the State of Pennsylvania in Washington.

At the close of the war Quay was elected to the Pennsylvania Legislature, beginning his first term in 1865. At that time he was a poor man, but a change in his financial condition speedily took place, and before half his first term had expired, it was seen that he had plenty of money at his command. He then started a weekly paper, *The Radical*, in Beaver, in his own interests. But this was not the only sign of his sudden prosperity. He speedily undertook the erection of a building bigger than any other structure in Beaver except the churches and Court-house. Speculation as to the source of his suddenly acquired wealth was very general, and doubts were openly expressed by the citizens as to the manner in which it had been obtained. They soon learned how he got it.

In 1867 there was a contest for the Senatorship between Simon Cameron, Gov. Curtin,

John W. Forney, and Thaddeus Stevens. Quay, who was already known as a "boss," was the candidate of the Curtin followers for Speaker of the House. Cameron supported J. P. Glass of Allegheny County for the Speakership, and with his command of patronage and money soon carried all before him. Quay, who, it was generally believed, owed all he was to the War Governor, resigned his own pretensions to the Speakership and joined the Cameron forces. It was reported that he had received \$13,000 for his work in Curtin's behalf, and that for his treachery to Curtin he received \$20,000. He nominated Glass in the party caucus for Speaker, and was in turn made Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means by that person when he made up his committees. Quay's course caused a sensation because it was considered a sure thing that if he had been elected Speaker, Gov. Curtin would have been elected Senator. Money was used extensively in Philadelphia and elsewhere to secure Curtin's election, and incidentally, of course, to make Quay Speaker, and the Beaver County statesman had, so it was said, and is still believed, the handling of quite a large fund in behalf of his patron.

CHARGED WITH BRIBERY.

In October, 1888, Quay was charged with attempting, in the course of a conversation in Philadelphia, to bribe Alexander P. Tutton, Supervisor of Internal Revenue for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, to prevent the seizure of a distillery in which he was interested. He proposed that Tutton should allow the irregular distillery to go on unmolested, and promised him that if the establishment was not seized, he (Tutton) should receive \$1,000 a week. The profits of the concern, it is said, would have been enormous if it had been unmolested by the revenue officers, one account placing the profit which Quay expected to realize personally as high as \$60,000. So notorious did Quay's misconduct become that an exposure took place about this time, and emphasis was given to the fact by the severe comments of the *Pittsburgh Commercial*, edited by C. D. Brigham. At that time Robert W. Mackey was the great Republican "boss" of Pennsylvania. His methods were the same as Quay's, with whom he was of course in sympathy. Their political fortunes were identical. He saw the damage to the party by the charge against Quay, and insisted that Quay should bring an action for libel against the editor of the *Pittsburgh Commercial*. A suit was accordingly begun. The writ was made returnable before Alderman Neepor as a

committing magistrate. Neepor was a follower of Mackey, and the result can therefore readily be imagined. The hearing took place in the Alderman's office on Diamond Street, in December, 1869. The case being one of criminal libel, the State was represented by a lawyer known as "Glorious" Tom Marshall, a friend of Mackey. The defendant was represented by John A. Hampton, a lawyer of high character and standing, and at present solicitor for the Pennsylvania Railway Company.

In the course of his direct examination, Quay denied that he had "extorted" \$13,000 from Gov. Curtin's friends in return for his support of the latter for Senator; that he had "betrayed" his benefactor, Gov. Curtin, for \$20,000 in favor of Cameron; that Robert Mackey, the State Treasurer, paid him money for his support as a legislator, or that he had ever attempted or proposed to bribe Supervisor Tutton, an internal-revenue officer, for the purpose of defrauding the Government. He admitted, however, that he was building a house in Beaver which would cost \$13,000.

The defence attempted to make the complainant himself explain how he had suddenly become so wealthy. The editor's counsel asked Quay what the office of Prothonotary of Beaver County had netted during the six years and a half which he held it, the inten-

tion being to show that at the time of his first election to the Legislature he did not own a dollar. The magistrate, however, excluded the question, and all similar questions of that character, on the objection of Quay's counsel, whereupon the defendant's counsel addressed the Alderman-Magistrate as follows:

It is stated in the newspaper article [containing the alleged libel] that certain money was got corruptly. The cost of Mr. Quay's building has been shown. I submit that if this is to be a full investigation, it is better that all these matters should come out. In a portion of the article complained of is a charge that Quay is erecting a building with money he got criminally. We now ask this question, "How much did the office you held prior to entering the State Legislature net you?" for the

purpose of showing his means from the time he left the office of Prothonotary down to the present day, to satisfy the Alderman that the charge in the newspaper is a true charge. In other words, to inquire into Mr. Quay's financial condition and ascertain where the means came from he used in the erection of this building. If this investigation has reference to anything, it is to give Mr. Quay an opportunity to make a full discovery of the things the article bears upon. He alleges it is untruthful. We meet the assertion by proposing to show that his pecuniary condition was such at the time he left the Prothonotary's office that it was not possible for him in the nature of things to accumulate the amount of money he is worth to-day. . . . If these proceedings are to be a purgation of the character of Mr. Quay, let him make a complete discovery of what he knows and answer our questions.

WHAT HE DARED NOT TELL.

The magistrate, however, persisted in his rulings in favor of the complainant, who, in reply to the further questions of the editor's counsel, admitted having moved in the caucus the nomination of Col. Glass for Speaker, although he had previously stated, in reply to his own counsel, that it was conceded that his (Quay's) election as Speaker would be Cameron's defeat. This is part of the cross-examination which followed:

Q. Mr. Quay, during the session of 1867, while you were a member of the Legislature, did you receive any sum of money, bonds, stocks, notes, or valuable securities of any description other than your pay as a member, from any source whatever?

The Prosecution—We object.

Mr. Hampton—Your usual ruling, is it, Mr. Alderman?

Alderman Neeper—Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Quay, do you know J. C. Bomberger, cashier of the Mechanics' National Bank of Harrisburg? A. I do.

Q. Do you keep an account at the Mechanics' Bank? A. I do.

Q. In the latter part of 1866 did you have a note for \$6,000 discounted at that bank?

Counsel objected. Magistrate Neeper sustained the objection. "Yes, of course you do," observed Mr. Hampton.

Q. Mr. Quay, did you not about three weeks after the election of Senator in 1867 take up the note for \$6,000? Statesman Quay replied that he did not remember. Mr. Marshall objected.

Mr. Hampton to Alderman Neeper—Your usual ruling?

Q. Mr. Quay, I would ask you whether, when you went into the Legislature, in 1867, you were the owner of any railroad stocks or bonds?

Objection by Quay's counsel.

Q. Be good enough to state whether, during the time when you were a member of the Legislature, you became owner of from \$10,000 to \$12,000 worth of stock in the Union Passenger Railway of Philadelphia?

Mr. Marshall—What is the purpose of the question?

Mr. Hamilton—We select this way of showing where the \$13,000 came from that Mr. Quay is putting into his house at Beaver.

After a wrangle Mr. Hampton said:

Mr. Quay, I will ask you whether from the time you were a member of the Legislature, in 1867, or prior to it, you became the owner of railway bonds valued at from \$10,000 to \$12,000? Ruled out.

Q. Mr. Quay, I will ask you have you become the owner—

"We object!" shouted Quay's counsel.

Mr. Hampton—It will not do to choke off the cross-examination in this manner. Mr. Quay, have you purchased any real estate in Philadelphia?

Objection, which was sustained.

Q. Have you purchased any property in Philadelphia worth from \$15,000 to \$20,000?

Objection.

Q. From the time you were a member of the Legislature until you left it, in 1867, did you accumulate anything?

Objected to.

Q. Do you know Alexander P. Tutton, Supervisor of Internal Revenue for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania? A. I do.

Q. Did you have a conversation with him in Philadelphia last fall? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what his duties were? A. I know he had charge of revenue matters.

Q. Do you know whether he had charge of distilleries? A. I know he sometimes seized distilleries.

Q. Had you a conversation with Mr. Tutton relative to the seizure of a distillery in Philadelphia which did not comply with the law?

Objection. Objection sustained.

Mr. Hampton asked if the ruling covered all questions on this subject.

A. It applies to the last question.

Q. State, please, Mr. Quay, whether you did or did not propose to Mr. Tutton to allow a certain distillery to violate the law and not to seize it for a time?

Objection, which was sustained by the magistrate.

Q. Were you present when an offer was made to Mr. Tutton that if he would do what I said in the previous question he would receive an envelope every Saturday evening containing a

\$1,000 note, with no writing saying where it came from?

This question was likewise ruled out, and Mr. Hampton, seeing that it was useless to attempt to probe the case further, ended his cross-examination and asked that the complaint be dismissed. In doing so he thus addressed the magistrate:

After a consultation, Mr. Alderman, we have concluded to ask you to dismiss this complaint and refuse to hold the parties to bail for court. Our reasons for making this request are that we believe, upon a careful investigation of the facts, as developed in the evidence, that probable cause has not been made out to warrant you in holding them to answer. The charge consisted in the publication of an alleged libellous article in the *Pittsburgh Commercial* of December 9, which Quay says was of and concerning him. We came here to answer for the publication of that libel. We had the right to meet our accuser face to face, and we did meet him here, but we had not the benefit to which the law entitled us, of cross-examining him in regard to the facts and circumstances by which he was connected with that publication. We say he stood before you speechless, so far as the cross-examination was concerned. In this we have been denied, as I think, all the right we are entitled to. When a party makes an accusation against another before a magistrate, he is bound to appear upon the witnessstand and submit to the cross-examination of the accused or his counsel touching all matters in relation to which he may have testified in chief. In this instance Quay was interrogated by Mr. Swartzwelder, his counsel, as to the allegations set forth in the libel, and went on to state that he believed himself to be the person alluded to, as he was putting up a brick building in the town of Beaver at a cost of some \$13,000. Your Honor will observe that his testimony was of a negative character, such as that he never received any money corruptly while a member of the Legislature or for supporting any man for public office; that he never approached a revenue officer by way of offering him a bribe, etc. Now, as I understand that article, I take it to mean and charge that the money that went into this building in Beaver was corruptly obtained by Quay while he was a member of the Legislature. That the others so accepted it was indicated by the course of their examination, and if the article does not mean that, then they have no case. I took that to be the theory and hypothesis upon which they based their prosecution. That was the whole scope and tenor of the article involving the charge. We consider that we had the right to interrogate Quay specifically upon the several matters and things that Mr. Swartzwelder brought out in the examination in chief.

He had sworn positively and directly that he never received money for the corrupt purpose indicated in that article. When I attempted to get at certain facts in cross-examination, objections were continually made by counsel on the other side, and these objections were sustained. In every effort made to elicit further information from the witness we were met by constant objections, and these objections were invariably sustained by you—whether properly or improperly it is not for me to say. We allege, Mr. Alderman, that an opportunity was denied us of going fully into these matters. At first we were led to suppose Quay wanted such a thorough

investigation, and that he was willing that we should commence with his career in 1865, before he entered the Legislature, going entirely through it, and that he would reply to all questions affecting it. We therefore complain, sir, that we have not had an opportunity allowed us to fully examine the witness. We say that a complete discovery has not been made, and that the truth has been shut out! In prosecutions of this character, where the acts of public men are criticised by newspapers, the truth may be given in evidence. I read, your Honor, an authority on this subject the other day, and one which my friends on the other side will not undertake to gainsay. You have before you now a very imperfect statement, on the part of the prosecutor, of matters and things testified to under the direction of his counsel; while we have been denied one of our legal rights, as, though we have met our accuser here, face to face, he has not manfully, truthfully, or properly made such discovery, or given such an exhibition of readiness to testify, as ought to be given in a case of this kind. We therefore say, for these reasons, that you have not before you such facts as would warrant you to hold these parties for trial.

We have endeavored to be calm in conducting our defence. Mr. Brigham has not indulged in any personal abuse of Mr. Quay as a man. His object was to afford Quay, at this time, an opportunity to state fully all such facts and circumstances as he might be inclined to submit to light. Now, sir, if you are disposed to dismiss this case, there is an end of it. If you think you have sufficient grounds for holding these parties to bail, then of course it will be proper to hear any more we may have to say.

Alderman Neepser then held the accused editor to bail in the sum of \$2,500.

Mr. Hampton thought that it might have been proper for him to have ascertained whether they had any evidence to offer. The Alderman replied that he had asked Mr. Hampton if he had witnesses.

Mr. Hampton—Well, it does not much matter. Your rulings during the hearing foreshadowed your present decision. I did not think it worth while to bring witnesses here from Philadelphia, Harrisburg, and other points before you, because they would be interrogated as to matters and things similar to those I questioned Mr. Quay about, and from the rulings which you made invariably on those questions, I do not conceive it would be proper to put these gentlemen to the trouble of coming before you.

The case should, of course, have come up again in the County Criminal Court, but it was never pushed for trial, and was finally dropped altogether, and the indicted editor had no further trouble in the matter. His paper, however, was not long permitted to remain hostile to the "bosses." It was purchased shortly afterwards from Mr. Brigham for a large sum of money by Robert Mackey, and immediately became a true-blue Stalwart organ, as it is to-day. The indictment against Brigham was abstracted from the court records by "Tom" Bayne—at present the member of Congress from Pittsburgh—and never returned.

AN ATTEMPT TO STEAL.

Following the great strike (and as a result of it) and the calling out of the State troops came the Indemnity Bill scandal. A bill was introduced into the Legislature to indemnify the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and others for the loss caused by the strikers. The sum of \$4,000,000 was appropriated for that purpose by the measure. One-half of that sum was to go to the lobby, official and otherwise, if the bill passed.

In the meantime, however, Quay had retired from the office of Secretary of State, which he held from January 22, 1873, to November 3, 1878. He had become tired of Beaver as a place of residence; the various scandals with which his name was connected there did not tend to improve his reputation in the eyes of the people of the town. He did not care for Harrisburg (the seat of the Legislature, a quiet, slow-going place), and so he caused a bill to be passed by both houses of the Legislature establishing the office of Recorder for Philadelphia, in which provision was made for emoluments in excess of \$40,000 a year. Naturally he had himself appointed to the office as soon as the act was signed by the Governor. In getting the Recordership Bill finally through the Legislature, Quay, however, lacked two votes, but he got them somehow. The people of Philadelphia had no voice in the transaction. In April, 1878, Quay moved to Philadelphia, occupied a house on North Broad Street, and established himself in his new office. It was discovered, however, that he was more useful at Harrisburg in an official position, and when Gov. Hoyt came in office, in 1879, Quay directed him to appoint him Secretary of the Commonwealth, and it was done.

The Legislature of 1879 assembled on January 7 and adjourned June 6 of the same year. It is considered to have been one of the most notable sessions in the history of Pennsylvania. Gov. Hoyt was entirely in the power of Quay, and Quay was the absolute "boss" of the situation at Harrisburg. If the bill appropriating \$4,000,000 (referred to above) to pay for the damages caused by the Pittsburgh rioters became a law, Quay would have had \$2,000,000 to divide. There was opposition, however, to the bill. Unfavorable comment had already been caused by the passage of the measure creating the office of Recorder of Philadelphia for Quay's individual benefit, and the newly elected members of the Legislature were not all in accord with him, although some of them were not in the House for sentiment. The advocates of the bill were very active in their attempt to secure votes, and Quay tried some sharp practice. One of the principal manipu-

lators was William H. Kemble, at present President of the People's Bank on Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. Under Quay's counsel, Kemble and Emil Petroff, a member of the House of Representatives, and others were detected as among the corruptors, and were indicted therefor by the Grand Jury of Dauphin County. Under the new Constitution it was found that such frauds could no longer be perpetrated as openly as theretofore with impunity. Petroff was tried for bribery and convicted, and then the lawyers for the prosecution were prepared to prosecute Kemble, as well as some other big men in the conspiracy whom they were after. These lawyers were more than surprised, however, when Kemble pleaded guilty, and they were deprived of the opportunity for an examination in open court with the expectation of obtaining damaging evidence against the chief conspirators, Quay among them. But Kemble knew what he was doing. He was the author, it is said, of the epigram, "Addition, division, and silence," and he smiled when sentenced by the Court to a term in the penitentiary, and is reported to have said to his friends who consoled with him: "Don't fear; I will prove another Samson and pull the temple down over their heads, unless they fix things for me."

When the excitement over the conviction of Petroff and the self-confessed criminality of Kemble diminished a little, Quay displayed his hand. The State Board of Pardons was a board which was practically in his power, and he proceeded to use it in behalf of his followers who were at the gates of the State prison. The Board of Pardons by law consists of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, then Quay; the Lieutenant-Governor, then C. W. Stone; the Attorney-General, then Henry W. Palmer, and the Secretary of Internal Affairs, then A. K. Doble. Quay caused the Board to be assembled in extra session, and without more ado proceeded to pardon the bribers. It is alleged that Lieut.-Gov. Stone objected seriously to the scheme, but the superior will of Quay dominated, and Petroff and Kemble were white-washed for their misdeeds by a vote of the Board, which recommended to the Governor their pardon. Gov. Hoyt, as Quay's obedient servant, of course carried out his part, and the culprits were set at liberty. The ostensible reason for the pardon of Kemble was that a part of his sentence (the imposition of "hard labor") was illegal, and that, therefore, the entire sentence must fail. Of this performance the *New York Tribune* said at the time in its editorial columns: "A more insolent defiance of public sentiment has not been seen since Tweed asked the taxpayers of New York what they were going to do about it."

CONTEMPLATED THEFT PREVENTED.

A curious circumstance leaked out at this time in connection with Kemble. Samuel Butler of Delaware County was the State Treasurer-elect. He was a man, so far as known at that time, above reproach, and it was considered by some of Quay's followers rather remarkable that he should have been permitted to get the office. The bond required of him was a large one, but he secured a number of good names as bondsmen in his home county and then sent it to Harrisburg and Philadelphia. Notwithstanding the fact that Kemble had been convicted, on his own confession, of bribery, his name was placed on the bond as one of the sureties. The bond was kept secret at Harrisburg, and when any one asked to see the list of sureties, a list was handed out with Kemble's name omitted.

The act of the Pardoning Board setting Kemble and Petroff at liberty caused a storm of indignation throughout Pennsylvania. Quay's conduct was strongly condemned, and Presbyterian synods passed resolutions against the Pardoning Board. In the meantime, however, the Indemnity Bill, so often referred to, had not advanced in the Legislature. The Senate could not be got into line to vote for it, although some of the Senators would have profited largely if the bill had become a law. Quay endeavored to use as a lever in favor of the measure in the Senate the so-called Border-Raids Bill, a bill which provided indemnity to residents in Franklin, Adams, York, and Lancaster Counties who suffered from the invasion of the Confederate troops during the war. He tried to trade votes from those counties for the Railroad Indemnity

Bill in return for his promised support of the Border-Raids Bill. The Indemnity Bill, however, was finally defeated in the Senate, and at once Quay despatched to a certain high official of the Pennsylvania Railway a telegram which passed over the private railroad wire to Philadelphia. It said: "Indemnity Bill defeated. Instruct — (designating a well-known editor with a Scotch name) to attack Border-Raids Bill." The Border-Raids Bill did not pass.

It is said that one of the favorite Quay practices to secure results favorable to himself is by intimidation. In Pennsylvania he has not scrupled to interfere with the workings of justice in a number of instances. For example; A. F. Lynch was Treasurer and Secretary of the Pittsburgh Bolt Company. He floated a lot of the concern's paper and forged the endorsement of his father, a respectable merchant, to enable him to do so. The President of the company was Edward Caylor, who was out of the transaction. Several of the notes were placed in the Iron City Bank, of which Alexander M. Byers was the President. Lynch's father was obliged to deny the endorsement, and the forger was arraigned before the Criminal Court. By some means Lynch secured Quay's interest in his behalf. The manner is broadly hinted at. Quay endeavored to induce President Byers and the bank officers to spare Lynch. Byers refused to condone the forgery, and Quay asserted broadly that he would secure his release if convicted. Lynch was convicted and sentenced to the Western Penitentiary. True to his threat, Quay, through his power over the Pardoning Board, soon had the culprit at liberty.

SPECULATING WITH STATE MONEY.

Quay had now, in 1879, enjoyed a career of uninterrupted political success for about fifteen years, and he became more reckless and unscrupulous, politically and socially. His excesses became greater than usual, and his private habits at Philadelphia and Harrisburg were such as to cause almost continuous scandal. His losses at cards were constant, and hard play and hard drinking made him nervous and irritable. It is said to have been a common question among those who were aware of what was going on: "How much did Quay lose last night?" At last he became so nervous that it began to be whispered about that he was breaking down. This was in the winter. His particular cronies at this time were J. Blake Walters, the Cashier of the State Treasury, and A. Wilson Norris. A friend of Walters is

quoted as saying that Walters was also observed at this time to be very fretful. Norris also was seen to be in a similarly nervous condition, and Quay was equally disturbed, although he was able to and did drown his care in drink, varying that occupation with frequent visits to a certain broker's office in Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. The fact was also noticed about this time that Amos C. Noyes ("Square Timber" Noyes) of Lockhaven, the State Treasurer, who was to retire from that office on May 1, that year (1880), seemed to be in an uneasy frame of mind. He was to be succeeded by Samuel Butler of Delaware. Butler also seemed to be very grave, especially when returning from visits to the Treasury before the date for his entering upon his duties as State Treasurer.

The cause for the nervousness of Messrs.

Quay, Walters, and Noyes was very simple. Quay and Walters had been speculating in certain stocks in the New York market with money belonging to the State, drawn out of the Treasury by Walters, the Cashier, who had substituted practically worthless securities in its place. The total deficit was about \$260,000. Noyes, the State Treasurer, was regarded as a man whose personal integrity was above reproach. He was a Democrat of the old school. Walters was in the lumber business, but in Harrisburg he fell in with the fast-drinking, card-playing set of which Quay was the head, and quickly became as dissipated as any of them. Through the influence of Senator William Wallace, Treasurer Noyes disregarded the advice of his friends and appointed J. Blake Walters Cashier of the Treasury.

It was the turning over of the State Treasury to the newly elected Treasurer that had to be done on May 1, 1880, that brought about a crisis in the affairs of Quay and his cronies. Butler, the new Treasurer, declined to take possession of the Treasury until a quantity of paper placed therein by Walters in lieu of good securities was replaced by cash. An exposure became imminent as the time drew near for Butler to take possession of the Treasury, and something had to be done. Accordingly a certain gentleman—said, on good authority, to have been "Chris" L. Magee—started for Harrisburg to see Quay. This friend found him in his bedroom at the Lochiel Hotel in an advanced state of intoxication, and only partially dressed. As the landlord put it,

"The old man was in a bad way; had been full for several days." In reply to the questions of the friend, who made his way to Quay's bedroom, as to "what was going on," Quay said that "he was debating whether he should cut his throat or jump into the Susquehanna River."

But he did neither. After he had calmed down a little, he told the friend the story above narrated of the use by himself and Walters of State moneys in speculation. Quay said that the deficit was pretty near \$200,000 (it was subsequently learned to be about \$260,000), and that he feared Blake Walters would "sneal," or that old "Square Timber" Noyes would make public the fact of the embezzlement.

The friend listened to Quay's story, and then told him he would go to Washington and see Don Cameron, and in the meantime he advised Quay to "keep quiet and cut off his liquor." The friend straightway repaired to Washington, where he informed Senator J. Donald Cameron of the situation. The Senator had only recently taken his seat in the United States Senate, succeeding his father, Simon Cameron, therein. He listened to the tale told by Quay's friend, and, it is said, gave vent to some very vigorous remarks as to the conduct of the Pennsylvania Republican boss. To this friend, however, he said: "Go back to Harrisburg and investigate this thing to the bottom. You will find that Quay has not told all. Probe it deeply and then report to me, and I must try to fix it up. The party must be looked after."

CAMERON TO THE RESCUE.

Then it was that it was learned (as already stated), as the result of the investigation by Quay's friend, that the deficiency was \$260,000. At this time Quay was still living in Philadelphia, whither he had moved after being appointed Recorder of that city, but he had moved from North Broad Street to another house. As soon as the investigation of the Treasury had been completed, Senator Cameron was informed on the details of the crime, and a meeting was arranged to take place at Quay's house to straighten the matter out. Thither repaired Senator Cameron, accompanied by a well-known lawyer, a gentleman of distinguished reputation in the legal profession, and who once filled a Cabinet office, to wit: Attorney-General Wayne MacVeagh. Quay and his friend were of course present, and also the State official involved in the robbery, and others. The State official referred to was apparently not much concerned, as the repayment of his share of the stolen money had been guaranteed by a wealthy firm of coal-operators

of Pennsylvania and New York. He had turned over what property he and his wife possessed in a provincial city. Quay had also given up all of the securities he owned, but still there was a large deficiency. Then Senator Don Cameron stepped in, and out of his own pocket, to save the credit of the Republican party of Pennsylvania, paid a sum of money in excess of \$100,000, and thus made good the funds of the State Treasury and at the same time saved Quay, Walters, and others from the penitentiary, or at any rate from the immediate prospect of going there.

When the business was completed, a high State official approached Senator Cameron and exclaimed:

"Senator, your act has mortgaged me to you for the remainder of my days."

To which the Senator replied:

"Well, sir, I regard my security as devilish bad."

Quay also ventured to thank the Senator. The answer was sharp and emphatic: "I

don't do this to save you, Quay, but for the sake of your wife and your children."

To the gentleman who first heard from Quay's own lips the story of the robbery, and who appealed to Senator Cameron for assistance, was left the carrying out of the details. He received notes of hand from Quay, and one of them, for \$25,000, has not yet been paid.

This affair was indirectly the cause of the death of two of the persons concerned in it. Amos C. ("Square Timber") Noyes never recovered from the shock the discovery of the robbery caused him. The habits of dissipation that Walters had acquired with Quay at Harrisburg also increased, and he finally died by his own hand. It was at first said that he died from blood-poisoning, but he really took his life in a moment of extreme depression. He always felt deeply his treachery towards "Square Timber" Noyes. He is indeed said to have been by no means a bad-hearted man, but he was weak, and easily yielded to the superior will of Quay and others of the Harrisburg ring. Before he died he wrote a letter in which he expressed contrition for his acts while cashier of the State Treasury and named the persons associated with him in the speculations which brought about the loss of the State money. He also said: "A will stronger than mine own led me on." That letter is in the possession of a person to whom it was given by the man to whom it was addressed. A lawyer named Spear assisted in adjusting the business with the Treasury when the money was refunded.

Quay resigned his office in November, 1882, and remained out of office for about three years. He was not in very good odor politically, although his descent on the Treasury through Walters, and the making good of the amount taken, was not known to the people; but the feeling caused by the Pardoning Board scandal, already mentioned, caused a turn-over

in politics. Then Robert E. Pattison was elected Governor of Pennsylvania, and held office from 1883 to 1887. Quay spent the time he was out of office at various places—at Atlantic City and the Continental Hotel, Philadelphia, in the winter. Some of his doings at Atlantic City and at certain places in Philadelphia were remarkable enough to cause a sensation if printed.

Although Quay's robbery of the State Treasury, which was made good (as related) by Senator Cameron, was not known outside of a limited circle, it was thought that enough people were aware of the acts of Quay and his friends to prevent him getting into office again, especially into the Treasury. But at the Republican Convention in 1885, a State Treasurer was to be nominated, and Quay wanted a "vindication." It was then that the Philadelphia *Press* said that his nomination would "take the lid from off the State Treasury and uncover secrets before which Republicans would stand dumb." He did not, however, openly announce himself as a candidate for State Treasurer. James McDevitt of Lancaster, an honest and wealthy Irish Roman Catholic and a staunch Republican, was a candidate for the office. Quay pretended to favor his candidacy in the fall of 1884, and kept other candidates out of the field until the time for electing delegates to the Convention. Then a series of newspaper articles called attention to McDevitt's religion—the farmers of Pennsylvania are strongly antagonistic to Roman Catholics—and thus it was easy for Quay's beelers, already advised what to do, throughout the State to secure the election of delegates sufficient to nominate Quay for State Treasurer. McDevitt was thrown overboard in the Convention and Quay was nominated. His election followed as a matter of course, and on May 1, 1886, he assumed the duties of State Treasurer, which office he held until 1887, when the Legislature made him a United States Senator.

PUBLIC MONIES MISUSED.

The office of State Treasurer of Pennsylvania is one of great importance and power, and the opportunity for wrong-doing is easy. The State funds are used in Pennsylvania in ways unknown in any other State. Large sums are given out to banks at a nominal rate of interest. The banks are such as are in league with the "boss" who leads his party. He causes the Treasurer to loan money in sums great and small to banks, and there is a division of the earnings which accrue in excess of the 2 per cent. interest paid the State. A regular supply for the party corruption fund is thus obtained, and many frauds have thus been

perpetrated. Banks have been charged with a specified sum, which is announced in the monthly report of the Treasurer, when a much smaller amount was actually loaned. For instance, a certain bank in the northern part of the State, not very far from Williamsport, was charged with \$50,000, and actually had \$25,000. The remainder was used in some kind of a secret operation by the magnates of the ring at Harrisburg. Quay while Treasurer had the final word as to the disposition of the money. Delemater, the Quay candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, has carried a large amount of Treasury funds in his bank at Mead-

ville—in excess of \$100,000. He paid 2 per cent. and loaned it out to the people of the county for 6, 7, or 8 per cent. It has come to be a regular recognition of party service to loan public money. Much of Quay's strength comes from the friends whom he holds in that manner.

For instance, the People's Bank of Philadelphia is an institution of which the self-confessed briber, who was pardoned by Quay's influence, W. H. Kemble, is President. The bank was established for the purpose of securing State funds, and at no time has it been without heavy deposits. The fact of its President having conspired to defraud the State never caused a change. His bank is to-day a public depository, and it will continue one probably as long as Quay remains in power. Thus it is that Kemble has grown rich on the profits of the hundreds of thousands of dollars of Treasury money in his safe. Embarrassment is not infrequently caused the State because there is no money in the Treasury. As fast as taxes are paid in from the counties, it has been put out on time to the bankers of the ring, and money has been borrowed at a higher rate of interest because of the deficiency.

Last year, after the Johnstown disaster, it was urged that Gov. Beaver should call a session of the Legislature to appropriate money for the stricken city. Gov. Beaver was disposed to assemble the Senators and Representatives, but Quay interposed a veto. There was no money in the Treasury to pay the expenses of the session, and means would have been required to secure funds which would call public attention to the condition of affairs. During the last session an effort was made by Samuel M. Uiheny, Representative of Shippensburg, to secure an investigation of the disposition of

a portion of the sinking fund. Damaging disclosures, it is said, would have followed, and the result was that he could not get his resolution up for a vote. The Speaker persistently refused to recognize him. Quay would not permit an investigation.

There are numerous other instances of Quay's sharp dealings. When the Brooks Liquor Bill was before the Legislature, an effort was made to have Philadelphia and Pittsburgh exempted from its provisions. The liquor-men of Allegheny raised \$80,000 to avert the threatened danger. William Friday, a prominent wholesale dealer, was the representative of the Allegheny men. He went to the Lochiel Hotel and saw Quay. The latter agreed to secure the desired amendment. He stated that the work would be done in the Senate, which body would decline to pass the Brooks bill unless the amendment was carried. It is reported that the money was divided between himself and a well-known coadjutor who has held an important office at Philadelphia. Friday returned to Pittsburgh happy. When the bill came before the Senate Quay became alarmed. There were many Republicans who desired the measure not to be passed as amended. The bill placed the power to issue licenses in the county courts. The pressure assumed proportions too strong for even Quay to resist, and the Senate passed the original measure. There was a clamor from the liquor-men of Allegheny and a portion of their money was returned. Quay would have carried out his bargain if he had had the power, for in such transactions it is said he has always been true to the clients who employ him.

There was a deal all this time which was intended to benefit Philadelphia liquor-dealers and a sum much larger than the Allegheny purse was raised.

USING STATE FUNDS AGAIN.

One morning while Norris was Auditor-General, a cab was driven to the door of a house of a person in Philadelphia with whom he was on confidential terms. The cab contained the Auditor-General and one other person. The former stepped out; his companion remained within. As Norris passed up the door-steps he involuntarily placed his hand to his breast and moved his fingers as if making sure of something concealed in the inside pocket of his waistcoat. He rang the bell, was admitted, and in a few minutes was closeted with his friend. After a few preliminary remarks the Auditor-General exclaimed: "I'm cursedly nervous!" and then he removed a package from his breast pocket.

"Do you see this?" he said in a low voice.

"It represents hundreds of thousands of dollars of State funds. It is going to carry Quay through another deal. By —, I'd think he had had enough fingering Treasury money. I'm afraid of a smash-up." Then Norris told his friend of Quay's latest raid on the Treasury, concluding with the remark: "If this affair turns out like the '79 business, I'll skip to Canada." This is the story of the second raid on the Treasury. Quay was served when State Treasurer by William Livsey as cashier of the Treasury. When his election to the United States Senate occurred, he could no longer act in the State office, and Livsey, a pliant follower, was appointed to the office of State Treasurer. W. D. Hart succeeded him and died. Then Livsey was reappointed, and

Boyer, the newly elected Treasurer, does not step in his place until May next. During the period when Quay was Treasurer he had the power to use the Treasury funds very much as he pleased.

There is a syndicate in Philadelphia which controls the horse railroads in various cities, and, as is well known, has a foothold in this city. They employ a lobby, and on occasions have called on Quay to help along certain measures towards enactment in the Legislature. He has been a useful and unscrupulous agent for the syndicate in that way. On the other hand, when he was in financial trouble, he went to certain members of the syndicate for aid. His calls on them for that purpose have not been infrequent.

The story of Quay's second raid on the Treasury is as follows: The Philadelphia railroad syndicate bought the plant, franchise, etc., of the North Chicago Railroad Company at Chicago and issued bonds which carried with them stock in the company. The investment was considered a good one, and when the scheme had reached the right stage, a certain member of the syndicate, which was under obligations to Quay, gave Quay a chance to pocket some of the profits. He was offered \$400,000 in bonds of the North Chicago Railroad Company, each bond carrying with it a

share of the capital stock. To buy the bonds, however, it was necessary to raise \$400,000 in cash to pay for them. Quay coolly took that sum of money out of the State Treasury and sent it to Philadelphia, where it was deposited in the People's Bank, the depository of the horse-railroad syndicate, and so paid for the bonds. The President of that bank was and is W. H. Kemble (the author of the epigram "Addition, division, and silence"), to whom reference has already been made. Kemble, as already stated, was saved from the penitentiary after he had pleaded guilty in court—after the conviction of Emil Petreff—by the influence of Quay over the State Pardoning Board. Quay allotted a portion of the stock he received to Wilson Norris, and the official of the Treasury previously referred to got a share of the prize.

Not a dollar of his own money did Quay use; he simply took the State money, which was embezzlement, and purchased \$400,000 worth of North Chicago Railway bonds, together with the accompanying stock. The profits of the transaction to Quay arose from the sale of stock which practically cost him nothing. He sold stock as high as \$2 or \$3, and, of course, made a large sum of money. The bonds were used to make the State Treasury good. Hart, the State Treasurer, knew about the transaction, and, it is said, shared in the profits.

DRIVEN TO DESPAIR BY QUAY.

It was this latest transaction with money belonging to the State that caused Norris so much uneasiness and induced him to drink to such an extent as to bring about his death. Four months, however, before that event took place he wrote the following letter to Quay:

PHILADELPHIA, February 5, 1888.

MY DEAR COLONEL: In the event of my death I wish as my last request that you see that Lizzie for herself and children receives my \$10,000 in the Chicago deal. This is the only legacy I can secure them, and I trust you to look after it.

Col. M. S. Quay.

Yours truly,

A. WILSON NORRIS.

After Norris's death Mrs. Norris (No. 2), the mother of his children, endeavored to obtain a settlement with Quay in accordance with the terms of the letter. When the Senator was at New York running the campaign (in 1888), she paid him a visit at the headquarters of the Republican National Committee. Quay made her many promises, and a henchman was detailed to make her stay in New York an agreeable one, but she was got rid of as quickly as possible.

At length, finding out that the "political father" of Norris did not intend to do anything, the matter was placed in the hands of A. Sydney Biddle of the legal firm of Biddle & Ward, on South Fifth Street, Philadelphia. A single move by Counsellor Biddle accomplished wonders. A response from Quay quickly followed. Silas W. Pettit, a lawyer of Philadelphia, was appointed to act for Quay, and finally stock to the value of \$10,000 was turned over to Mrs. Norris through Sydney Biddle. Pettit informed the lawyer that Norris had no claim on the funds for value received, that Quay had allowed him to come into the transaction as an act of friendship. Hart, the State Treasurer, made a row over the matter. He was in the deal sufficiently to be fearfully worried lest blame should fall on him, and he worked himself into a fit of nervousness, which ended in prostration, from which he never recovered. Like "Square Timber" Noyes and Walters, Hart, so his friends allege, got his death as a result of the unscrupulous dishonesty of Quay.

HOW THE LIQUOR-DEALERS SUFFERED.

As a timely comment on the charges of dishonesty and debauchery and political chicanery brought against Quay, the following story of

the liquor-dealers' late campaign in Pennsylvania, in which the wholesale bribery of newspapers and politicians—the amounts paid

to Quay and other leaders—is of especial interest at this time. This story, substantially, was printed in a recent number of *The Voice*:

The bill to submit a prohibitory amendment to a vote of the people of Pennsylvania finally passed the Legislature January 31, 1889. The date set for the vote was June 18, 1889. The surprising fact was made known at the time that Mr. Quay, Mr. Cooper, and other leaders who were hand-in-glove with the wholesale liquor-dealers lent their influence to the passage of the bill.

The liquor-dealers began their work in 1887. One of their first acts was to form a State Committee, with Harry P. Crowell as secretary and manager, and one of the first things Mr. Crowell did was to secure Mr. Quay's services in advance by liberal compensation paid during the three years preceding the election. It was charged at the time of the campaign, by the Philadelphia correspondent of the *New York Times*, that the brewers of Pennsylvania had paid \$200,000 into the hands of the Republican leaders to defeat the amendment. The charge could not, however, be substantiated at the time, although there were many indications pointing to an agreement of some kind. The leaders of both parties declared that as the fight was non-partisan, they would not take sides, and very few of them did so publicly. But when election day came, it was found that all the political machinery of both parties was being used to defeat prohibition. A majority of 188,127 against the amendment was the result, of which 90,000 came from Philadelphia. Ex-Attorney-General Palmer, who was Chairman of the State Prohibitory Amendment Committee, who had discredited all the warnings *The Voice* persistently made that a deal of just this kind was on foot with the politicians, had his eyes opened too late, and on the day after the election expressed himself in the following vigorous language:

The defeat of the prohibition amendment in Pennsylvania was occasioned by the combined villany of the Republican and Democratic machines using every practice known to corrupt politics.

The full, detailed story of the alleged conspiracy between the politicians, the press, and the liquor-dealers to defeat the prohibitory amendment, confirming all that was charged by *The Voice*, is told by H. P. Crowell of Philadelphia, the manager of the liquor-dealers' campaign against the amendment, in an interview with Col. R. S. Cheves. Mr. Crowell is now a member of the firm of Crowell & Glass Cold Storage Company of Nos. 50-54 Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia. In that interview Mr. Crowell said, among other things:

"The first meeting of the liquor-men was called to convene in Harrisburg, which was a failure. The second meeting was held in Phila-

delphia, and was a success, for at that meeting a State Executive Committee was selected, and I was made Secretary, with power to act and arrange for the fight. At that meeting plans were also adopted by which money could be raised. In the first place, we assessed the sales of all beer per annum at ten cents per barrel. We levied an assessment of \$1,000 on all the large hotels like the Continental, and they paid it like little men, and from \$25 to \$50 on all the smaller retail shops. Besides, each brewer was required to solicit money from all kindred interests—that is, every man in trade with whom they had dealings, those engaged in making barrels, those from whom we bought our horses, and wagons, and grain, and machinery, etc., was solicited to contribute to a campaign fund, and if such persons failed after a reasonable time to do so, a notice was forwarded intimating that a prompt compliance would save trouble and a possible boycott, thus forcing hundreds to help us who did it reluctantly. By this plan we raised over \$200,000, which was expended by the State Committee. Besides, local committees in every community raised and expended large sums during the campaign and on election day. Appeals for money were made to the trade throughout the country, and large sums were contributed by the Brewers' Association and the National Protective Association."

"How did you dispose of this immense amount of money?"

"Besides the current expenses, we paid it out to the newspapers, politicians, and some for literature, and some for public speakers."

"How did you manage to enlist the politicians on your side? Did you offer them money?"

"Yes; we would go to the leaders, both Republicans and Democrats, and say, 'This is not a party fight, and you cannot afford to be against us. If you do we will remember you at the next regular election, but if you will help us we will pay you liberally for your support.'"

"Such State leaders as 'Bill' Leeds, Charlie Porter, who is Chairman of the City Republican Committee, Cooper and 'Dave' Martin, and others, and a lot of Democratic leaders we paid \$500 apiece, and \$200 apiece to local leaders, and \$5 apiece to men who worked and manned the polls on the day of election."

"Did I pay Quay any money? Yes; for three years he bled us, and our contributions to him came very near beating us at the polls. It was reported that we contributed money to defeat Cleveland, and the Democrats got hold of it, and a plan was on foot to have the Democratic vote cast for the amendment as a punishment to the Republican brewers of the State, and it would have succeeded if I had not found it out in time and 'fixed' the boys, but it cost us a big pile of money to do so."

We had all the workers on our side, and the machines of both old parties were with us. We paid the County Commissioners of this county to let us have the poll-list exclusively for our use with the understanding that we were not to return the list until after the election. So the Prohibitionists, with no window books, no money, no organization, had no show whatever against us."

It is proper to state that the interview with Crowell was obtained by stratagem. A letter was sent to him from Lincoln, Nebraska, where a prohibition amendment is pending, asking for his advice as to the best way to oppose it. The writer of the letter, W. E. Johnson, wrote: "Give me your best plan for working through political machinery, and especially how to silence the pulpit and the press."

Crowell fell into the trap and replied at some length, saying among other things:

"I was the Secretary and Manager of the Anti-Prohib fight last year, and when the fight was over and our victory so great, I *destroyed* all our documents and resigned from the Association, and am devoting all my time to the

above business. . . . If you are going to have a fight if you was to come here I would give you I think in three hours more than I could write in a week and tell you and show you some of our documents, form of collecting funds and spending and winning the fight." The interview followed with Col. R. S. Cheves of *The Voice*.

Of Mr. Crowell, Mr. Wharton Barker says in the *American*: "Mr. Crowell is a well-known business man of this city, and his statement in regard to the matter, made with much detail (under the supposition that he was giving 'points' to the anti-Prohibition campaign in Nebraska), leaves no room for doubt as to its correctness. And in a letter written on the first instant to the interviewer who drew the facts from him (and who really represented the *Prohibition Voice* of New York), Mr. Crowell admonishes him that 'a part of it should be kept secret, and not used as I give it to you. That was about our *United States Senator*. Should you make use of that in connection with my name, it would do me a great injury, and if it got to his ears would be the means of doing your cause a great deal of harm.'"

MR. LEA'S LETTER.

Appended is the open letter concerning Quay heretofore printed in *The Evening Post*, being written by H. C. Lea of Philadelphia, and addressed to the President of the United States:

"SIR: No graver scandal has darkened our political history than the charges brought against Senator Quay by the *New York World* in its issues of February 10 and March 3. It would be useless here to recapitulate them further than to say that, with full details of names and places and dates, the *World* asserts him to be a man whose political career has been a succession of flagrantly dishonest acts, including the temporary abstraction from the State Treasury of \$260,000 in one instance and of \$400,000 in another.

"No such accusations, involving iniquity so varied and so continuous, and supported by such an array of minute detail, have ever before, I believe, been brought against a politician so conspicuous. If they are true, Senator Quay ought to be in the penitentiary. If they are false, he is a cruelly libelled man; his accuser is a journal of the highest financial standing, and no jury of his countrymen would refuse him exemplary damages that would put him beyond all future reach of want. Vindication and profit both await him as an incentive to prove his innocence; but although two months have elapsed since the gravest of the charges were made public, neither solicitude for his character nor desire of gain has prompted him to break silence. It is his own fault if the public should regard him as acquiescing in the truth of the charges.

"It is true that the crimes alleged against Senator Quay are connected only with his career as a Pennsylvania boss, but your close connection with him has rendered the scandal national. You were duly warned in advance from a friendly source of the dangers of such an alliance, yet, by accepting his man, Mr. Wanamaker, as a member of your Cabinet, you assumed responsibility for both of them. In pursuance of this alliance you have enlarged Mr. Quay's importance by virtually giving him control of the Federal patronage in Pennsylvania, thus rendering him the dictator of the Republican party in the State.

"He boasted of your subserviency to him when, in explaining his triumph over Representative Dalzell in the struggle for the Pittsburgh Post-office, he publicly said that 'the President, though very anxious to gratify Mr. Dalzell, for whom he has a high esteem, could not, under all the circumstances, well avoid complying with my wishes.' Even Mr. Quay's remarkable silence under the accusations of the *World* does not seem to have lessened his influence over you. He signalized his return from Florida a week or two since by capturing the Pittsburgh Surveyorship of Customs against candidates urged respectively by Secretary Blaine and Representative Dalzell.

"Indeed, his power would seem to be as great in Washington as in this State, for the party organs now tell us that he has been endeavoring to buy off a successful candidate for the Governorship with an Assistant Secretaryship of War. In thus entering into a political partnership with

Mr. Quay, you must share the losses as well as the gains of the venture. It is not Pennsylvania alone, nor even the Republican party only, that has a right to protest; every citizen of the land must feel humiliation at the smirch thus inflicted on the Chief Magistracy of the nation.

"As a Republican by conviction, ardently desiring the success of the party so long as it deserves success, let me request you, Mr. President, to take a calm survey of the situation and render to yourself an account of your stewardship. Thirteen months ago you entered upon the duties of the highest office which the world has to bestow; your party was supreme in the control of both houses of Congress and of the Executive; everything promised a prosperous and useful Administration, in which you, by simply adhering to the pledges under which you were elected, might earn another term from the confidence and gratitude of the people. The only cloud upon the political horizon was your acceptance of a Postmaster-General at Mr. Quay's dictation, ostensibly as a reward for certain services performed during the canvass. That cloud, then no larger than a man's hand, has spread till it covers the firmament.

"Look back now and reflect upon your work. You have sedulously devoted yourself to the distribution of 'patronage'; you have turned out nearly 40,000 Democratic office-holders, and in this ignoble business you have filled vacancies thus made by giving 'recognition' to the worst element in the party. You have thus degraded it to the lowest level, till it no longer deserves or enjoys the public confidence, and its interest, as well as that of the nation, demands its purification by defeat. You have earned for it the denunciation of the Hebrew prophet: 'The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord and say, Is not the Lord among us? None evil can come among us. Therefore shall Zion for your sake be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall

become heaps.' But it needs no prophet to foretell the result.

"The elections of last November were a warning that the people would not tolerate your methods. You have refused to heed this lesson, and the election of next November will emphasize it. The narrow Republican majority in the lower house will be swept away, and your path for the latter half of your Administration will be a path of thorns. You have rewarded the magnificent majority of 80,000 given to you by Pennsylvania by riveting upon her the chains of Quayism. You need not wonder that disaffection is spreading rapidly throughout her borders in a manner that may render even her allegiance doubtful. The outlook for 1892 is even darker. Were the Presidential election to take place to-morrow, there could scarce be doubt of Democratic success. Let me counsel you, Mr. President, as a friend, to reflect that this has been your work in one short year of misused power.

"If this retrospection should bring with it repentance and amendment, you still have before you three years which may be fruitful for good. Bear in mind that 'faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.' Discard the advisers who are luring you to your downfall. Recognize that the truest political expediency lies in the application of conscience to public affairs, and that you can serve your party best by stimulating the nobler aspirations of the nation, rather than by pandering to the baser appetites of spoilsmen.

"Cease to expect to gather figs of thistles or to touch pitch without defilement. Apply to your public duties the high standard of morality to which you adhere in your private life. Remember that evil can give birth only to evil, and that you, as Chief Magistrate of sixty-five millions of freemen, have on your soul a charge for which you must reckon to posterity and to God.

"I am, Mr. President, your obedient servant,

"HENRY CHARLES LEA.

"PHILADELPHIA, April 8, 1890."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 789 132 3



permalife®
pH 8.5